

the hours, half the pay. Where did the school board put the blame? They put it directly on the President's health care law. They said they can't afford the Washington-mandated health insurance for all of their workers, so they are cutting back on the hours for substitute teachers, cutting the hours for cafeteria workers, cutting the hours for custodians, for paraprofessionals who work with the kids. Is that what the President envisioned? Is that what the President means when he says "forcefully defend and be proud"? Cutting back things for children in our schools, is that the President's solution for health care, making it harder for kids to get an education and making it harder for teachers to teach?

One custodian told the paper that it is depressing knowing his pay is about to be cut. He said, "It's rough the way it is. Why make it harder to survive?" That is my question to the President of the United States and to Senators on the floor who come to talk about the health care law.

Why make it harder to survive? Why, Mr. President? You said people should forcefully defend and be proud of this law. Are you proud of it, Mr. President? That is what I need to know. That is what the American public wants to know.

Is the President proud that people are getting their hours cut in half specifically because of his law? And school districts are pointing to that as the cause. Is the President proud he is making it harder for Americans to survive?

Now, some people aren't just getting their hours cut; they can't get hired in the first place because of the health care law. That is what one business owner said in an op-ed for the Charlotte Observer newspaper in Charlotte, NC. It ran September 10 and was entitled "How ObamaCare jams a stick in my company's wheels." Rodney Pitts, who runs the Southern Elevator Company in North Carolina, says he wants to hire more elevator mechanics for his business, but he hasn't been able to hire anyone this year. Why? He says the main reason is because of the costs associated with the health care law and all of the requirements of the health care law. He said, "Thousands of businesses in Charlotte and in North Carolina are in the same holding pattern."

So people all across the country who want to work won't get that opportunity because businesses can't afford to take on all of the extra costs of the President's health care law. That is an extremely destructive side effect of the law. It is hurting American families.

This health care law is hurting our economy. Every Democrat in the Senate voted for this health care law—every one. Where are the Democrats willing to forcefully defend these alarming side effects of this health care law? Is the President ready to go to North Carolina and talk to this business owner? Is the President going to say he is proud his health care law is

keeping the businesses from hiring more people in North Carolina and all across the country?

This isn't the kind of health care reform the American people needed. It is not the kind of health care reform the American people wanted. People didn't want a law that forced them to get rid of the insurance which they had and liked and which worked for them and for their families. They didn't want a law that forced their local schools to cut the hours of custodians and part-time teachers, cafeteria workers, and people who look after their children. That is not how to help people in a community.

These are the tragic side effects of the President's health care law. Republicans are going to continue to talk good patient-centered reforms, reforms that get patients across the country the care they need from a doctor they choose and at a lower cost.

We are going to talk about restoring people's freedom, freedom to buy health insurance that works for them, for their families because they know what works best for them, not President Obama. We are going to talk about giving people choices, not Washington mandates. Republicans are going to keep offering real solutions for better health care without all of these intrusive and intolerable side effects.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:31 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF JEFFERY MARTIN BARAN TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

NOMINATION OF STEPHEN G. BURNS TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk reported the nominations of Jeffery Martin Baran, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30,

2015; and Stephen G. Burns, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the term of five years expiring June 30, 2019.

VOTE ON BARAN NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on the Baran nomination.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to yield back all time on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Jeffery Martin Baran, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 2015?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 265 Ex.]

YEAS—56

Baldwin	Heinrich	Nelson
Begich	Heitkamp	Pryor
Bennet	Heller	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reid
Booker	Inhofe	Rockefeller
Boxer	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Brown	Kaine	Schatz
Cantwell	King	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Landrieu	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Coons	Levin	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	Markey	Udall (NM)
Durbin	McCaskill	Walsh
Feinstein	Menendez	Warner
Franken	Merkley	Warren
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Hagan	Murphy	Wyden
Harkin	Murray	

NAYS—44

Alexander	Enzi	Moran
Ayotte	Fischer	Murkowski
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Chambliss	Hoeven	Rubio
Coats	Isakson	Scott
Coburn	Johanns	Sessions
Cochran	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Collins	Kirk	Thune
Corker	Lee	Toomey
Cornyn	Manchin	Vitter
Crapo	McCain	Wicker
Cruz	McConnell	

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON BURNS NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on the Burns nomination.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, are we on the second nomination in this stack of nominations?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back on this stack of nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.